Remarks:

Claim 1 has been amended, new claim 31 has been added and claims 16-30 were previously withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 1-15 and 31 are currently pending for consideration.

I. Amendments:

Amended claim 1 now recites that the molar ratio of first substituent to second substituent is from 10:1 to 1:10. Support for amended claim 1 can be found in the specification at page 7, lines 31-32. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

New claim 31 depends from claim 1 and recites that the molar ratio of first substituent to second substituent is from 7:1 to 1:7. Support for new claim 31 can be found in the specification at page 7, lines 31-33. Again, no new matter has been added.

II. The Invention:

The presently claimed invention is directed to a process for the production of paper from an aqueous suspension containing cellulosic fibres, and optionally fillers. The process includes adding to the suspension a cationized polysaccharide product which includes a polysaccharide having (i) at least one first substituent having an aromatic group and (ii) at least one second substituent having no aromatic group, and forming and draining the suspension on a wire. The molar ratio of the first substituent to the second substituent is from 10:1 to 1:10, preferably 7:1 to 1:7.

The combination of aromatic and non-aromatic substituents in specific ratios, as presently claimed, results in improvements in burst strength index, dewatering time and/or retention.

III. Rejections:

35 USC §102

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-10 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Persson et al (WO 99/55964). The Applicants respectfully traverse.

Persson et al. is directed to a process for the production of paper from a suspension, which includes adding to the suspension a drainage and retention aide that includes a cationic or amphoteric polysaccharide, and forming and dewatering the suspension on a wire. The cationic polysaccharide has a hydrophobic group.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Nowhere do Persson et al. disclose a process for the production of paper from a suspension, which includes adding to the suspension a cationized polysaccharide product which includes a polysaccharide having (i) at least one first substituent having an aromatic group and (ii) at least one second substituent having no aromatic group, wherein the molar ratio of the first substituent to the second substituent is from 10:1 to 1:10, as presently claimed in amended claim 1.

By including a cationized polysaccharide product in which the molar ratio of the first substituent to the second substituent is from 10:1 to 1:10, the suspension shows improvements in burst strength index, dewatering time and/or retention, compared to suspensions with cationic polysaccharides, but without the combination

of substituents having aromatic and non-aromatic groups as presently claimed (see examples).

Therefore, as Persson et al. do not disclose each and every element as set forth in the present claims and do not show the identical invention in as complete detail as claimed, it is respectfully submitted that Persson et al. cannot anticipate the present claims. See *Verdegaal Bros.*, 814 F.2d at 631 and *Richardson*, 868 F.2d at 1236.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1, 3-5, 7-10 and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Persson et al. be withdrawn.

35 USC §103

Claims 2, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Persson et al. in view of Froelich et al. (WO 2002/12626). Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Persson et al. in view of Klemets et al. (WO 99/55965).

As claims 2, 6, and 11-12 all depend from claim 1, they each require the claimed ratio of substituents. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Froelich nor Klemets cure the deficiency in Persson et al. On this basis alone, it is respectfully submitted that the asserted combinations of references do not render the current claims obvious.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 2, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being obvious over Persson et al. in view of Froelich et al., and the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being obvious over Persson et al. in view of Klemets et al., be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application as amended is now in proper form for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any questions relating to this Amendment or to this application in general, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert C. Morriss
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 42,910

Akzo Nobel Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept.
7 Livingstone Avenue
Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522-3408
(914) 674-5459